

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 remain in the application. No new matter is added by the amendments to the specification.

The Rejections:

In the Office Action dated January 24, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kraft (4529065). The Examiner stated that Kraft teaches in figures 1-4 an elevator system for operation under emergency conditions with a primary source of power 120 and auxiliary supply 170 that are utilized to operate the locking mechanism 39 in the event of power failure. According to the Examiner, relay VM and contacts VM-1, VM-4 are actuated upon primary power failure and locking mechanism 39 contains solenoids 64, 65. The Examiner further stated that the device operates wherein upon a primary power failure, the locking mechanism remains in its current position based on landing zone detection and if the elevator is in a landing zone, the locking mechanism can only be changed by a passenger providing manual assistance to the doors. If the door is closed, the Examiner stated that they may be opened by manual force which allows the locking mechanism to unlock and if the doors are open, further manual actuation allows the locking mechanism to actuate and prevent closing of the doors. According to the Examiner, the device would appear to operate in a similar manner if the secondary power supply also ends (Claim 17).

The Response:

The Examiner stated that the title of the invention is not descriptive. Applicants amended the title to overcome this objection.

The Kraft elevator system includes a circuit and an electromechanical locking mechanism enabling a car door to be unlocked following a power failure. The Examiner's statement that the Kraft device operates such that upon a power failure the locking mechanism remains in its current position based upon landing zone detection is incorrect. When the car is stopped within a landing zone the door is unlocked by the energized door latch relay DRL (Col. 8, Lines 52-56). A power failure will deenergize DRL thereby locking the door. A slight movement of the door by a passenger will unlock the door and it is kept unlocked by a permanent magnet. Upon the

0001327020123691049-1

slight movement of the door, an electrical circuit causes a capacitor to discharge through a solenoid coil which unlocks the door lock. Thus, the Kraft circuit will always cause the car door to be locked in response to a power failure.

In contrast, Applicant's Claims 1-17 define a bi-stable restrictor for and a method of controlling the opening of an elevator car door whereby when the car is stopped at a floor landing (door unlocked) due to a primary power failure, the locking device will be maintained in the unlocked position (without interaction by car passengers). When the car is stopped (door locked) due to a primary power failure, the locking device will be maintained in the locked position (without interaction by car passengers). Also, as recited in Claim 10, when the secondary power source fails the car door will remain in the unlocked or locked state that existed before the power failed.

In summary, the invention defined by Claims 1-17 is not shown in or suggested by Kraft.

The Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The Examiner cited Sager et al. (US 5,693,919), Uchino et al. (US 4,376,471), Fargo et al. (6,269,910), Simpson (US 3,706,357) and the two foreign references to illustrate similar elevator emergency door/restrictor actuation. Applicant reviewed these references and found them to be no more pertinent than the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in the rejections.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicant believes that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.